REMARKS

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 16-18 and 20-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 6 and 7 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I.   Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Office Action indicates that claims 2-5, 11, 16 and 20 are allowed, and claims 6-8, 12-13, 17-18 and 21-22 include allowable subject matter.

II.   Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejections claims 6-8, 12-13, 17-18 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion.

Regarding claim 6, the Office Action asserts that the functions of the "address generation circuit" are unclear. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that it is unclear how the address generation circuit switches between generating addresses for a first control information area and addresses for the a second control information area of the memory based on an arbitration result from an arbitration circuit. Thus, the Office Action requests further clarification regarding the functions of the address generation circuit with respect to the switching of generating addresses for the first and second control information areas based on an arbitration result. For the sake of understanding only, Applicants provide the following example from the specification.

Figures 7 and 18 show an exemplary embodiment of a data transfer control device including an SBP-2 core 82 (transfer execution circuit), a DMAC 40 having an arbitration circuit 400 and an address generation circuit 420, and a RAM 80 (randomly accessible package storage memory). The address generation circuit 420 receives various signals such as HWDMARun and RealGo from the arbitration circuit 400. See Fig. 18, and specification,

page 36, lines 19-22. The address generation circuit 420 switches between generating addresses for the HW header areas or the ordinary header areas, based on the HWDMARun signal that is <u>an arbitration result</u> from the arbitration circuit 400. See specification, page 42, lines 5-9.

As shown in Fig. 4, if the HWDMARun signal is 1 (for HW transfer), a pointer PTR is set to the HW transmission header (AR3). See specification, page 42, lines 10-12. Thus, the write addresses for transmission headers is created by the SBP-2 core 82 are generated by updating the pointer PTR. See specification, page 42, 12-14. If the HWDMARun signal is 0 (outside of HW transfer), the pointer PTR is switched by setting it to the transmission header area (AR6). See specification, page 42, lines 15-17. Thus, the write addresses for transmission headers created by firmware are generated by updating the pointer PTR. See specification, page 42, lines 17-19. Therefore, the address generation circuit 420 switches addresses between the HW header areas and the ordinary header areas using only the HWDMARun signal from the arbitration circuit 400. See specification, page 42, lines 20-26. This address switching ensures that the SBP-2 core 82 can write created headers sequentially to the dedicated HW header areas within the SBP-2 core 82 so hardware can create headers for a series of packets to be transferred continuously. See specification, page 42, lines 26-27.

As discussed, above, the arbitration circuit arbitrates between hardware (HW) and firmware (FW) transfers. See specification, page 35, lines 21-22. Claim 6 is amended to clarify that the arbitration circuit performs arbitration between a packet transfer by a first start command and a continuous packet transfer by a second start command. No new matter is added, and the claim is not narrowed by such amendment.

Regarding claim 7, the Office Action asserts that the term "the object" of continuous packet transfer is indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that it is unclear which

features are being referred to by the term "the object." Thus, the Office Action requests

further clarification regarding the term "the object."

The term "the object" is deleted. In accordance with the specification, page 44, lines

15 - page 45, line 2, claim 7 is amended to clarify that the second data is transferred by a

continuous transfer processing of a transfer execution circuit. The claim is not narrowed by

such amendment. No new matter is added.

It is respectfully submitted that the features of claims 6 and 7 are amply explained and

supported by the figures and the specification. Thus, the features of claims 6 and 7 are not

indefinite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C.

§112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

III.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that

this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt

allowance of claims 2-8, 11-13, 16-18 and 20-22 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Moore
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNM/kzb

Date: November 24, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461